

gdy ltr 4/3/71

CIA, FBI cooperation alleged Faculty 'spies' condemned

By BEN OEHLER

The University should publicly declare intelligence gathering incompatible with the academic community, according to one of the nine professors who last week alleged routine faculty cooperation with the CIA and the FBI.

Speaking during a panel discussion in Coffman yesterday, Erwin Marquit, associate professor of physics, helped give the first public disclosure of academic collusion with civilian intelligence agencies.

Marquit spoke of a "worldwide strategy" to subvert democratic institutions in the name of anti-communism, and read New York Times accounts of several instances of CIA subversion abroad. American scholarship and research have been "made difficult" by the CIA's use of academic research as a cover for its international activities, he said.

In a statement published last week on behalf of the Faculty Action Caucus, it was alleged that faculty members who travel overseas to international academic or professional conferences are likely to be contacted by CIA or FBI agents and asked if they will agree to be interviewed by the agents.

If granted, such an interview usually consists of a briefing of what the particular agency is interested in and what the faculty member should watch for on his trip. While some faculty members

decline to be briefed before their journey abroad, post-journey debriefings are frequent.

He said that the greatest problem for faculty is the conflict between scholarliness and intelligence-gathering. He questioned whether scholars of different nations can meet with free and open relationships if one or both have dual purposes.

"If I take a trip to the Soviet Union, is it for me as a scholar or for me as an agent? Am I given funds for my scholarship or my spying?"

The secret involvement of the CIA in international conferences threatens the progress of international cooperation between scholars, he said.

The fear of loss of funding and research opportunities often forces faculty members to compromise, he said. Those who refuse lose out. "In some cases University administrators have been asked to help pinpoint cooperative faculty members," he said.

"We should take the administration off the hook by declaring any intelligence gathering incompatible with the academic community. There is no protection. I was approached to talk about one of my advisers. How can I tell them to be free and open in the classroom. This is what a faculty member faces when there is no University policy."

Morton Hamermesh, head of the Physics department did not share Marquit's zeal for a policy statement solution to the problem. Hamermesh, in fact, did not

share Marquit's assessment of the danger of the problem.

The greatest problem, Hamermesh said, "is that the CIA is so god-awful inefficient — wasting the tax payers' money for information which they could obtain for a pittance. Most of the information is public," he said.

Hamermesh called himself "an expert on Russian physics" and said therefore that he had had frequent inquiries from intelligence. "I don't think that I have ever been asked a question that I could not answer openly."

Eugene Eidenberg, assistant vice president for administration and author of the recently released report on military surveillance, also was opposed to administrative policies prohibiting cooperation with intelligence units.

He emphasized that information held by the University should be released only under the strictest of guidelines and that there should be no secret intelligence gathering. But he said that cooperation of individual faculty members "must be a matter of personal judgement."

"Our reaction is to close the institution up as tight as we can. I would urge great caution. We can not relate with our environment if we shut off avenues of communication to the outside by telling faculty what to do," Eidenberg said.

Eidenberg said that since some intelligence gathering is justifiable, the only solution is to demand full public disclosure of operations as they exist.